

CHAPTER 3

MANAGEMENT OF TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT IN TIMES OF UNCERTAINTY

Aleksander Noworól, Paweł Hałat

Introduction

Management of territorial development constitutes at the moment a compelling and dynamically changing element of public management. This requires each of the terms to be interpreted. Thus, it is not obvious what this “territory” which is being managed is – a unit of administrative division, or a functional urban area. Nowadays, the notion of socio-economic (including – territorial) development is questioned, by proving the deficiency in the definition of this term, often equated with the growth of gross domestic product, and proposing an alternative model of territorial change in the form of the so-called de-growth. As a result, the approach to the management of thus outlined processes of territorial transformation is changing. The key question emerges: to what extent these processes occur spontaneously, releasing endogenous forces of social self-organisation, and to what extent they are steered by authorities and public administration? The authors’ reflections will be centred around these questions and dilemmas.

The basis of these considerations are analyses of theoretical works concerning territorial development and public affairs management, as well as the authors’ direct participating observation in managerial processes. It involved preparing analytical papers, expert opinions, and operational strategies and programmes for the Polish Government and local governments.

Territory in the volatile reality of the 21st century

The first decades of the 21st century reveal specific moving forces that necessitate the revision, or perhaps just the renewal of the examination of the contemporary world. It would be useful to evoke a number of phenomena and theoretical approaches:

- development of ICT, quality-wise different compared to the 20th century, and its consequences:
 - for social communication – control of connections established in Internet networks enable to control values, including political and economic values (Dawson, 2008, pp. 128-147).
 - for the development of the Internet of Energy and Logistics that build the comprehensive intelligent infrastructure of the 21st century, dubbed the “Internet of Things”, using big data and indirectly creating advanced intelligent management solutions (Rifkin, 2016).
- globalisation of the socio-economic life, based on the use of personal computers and the Internet, which transforms the plane of cooperation from a vertical to a horizontal one, and causes an increase of the importance of creative individuals, who nowadays compete with huge organisations; it is linked to the metropolisation and introduces imbalance in the spatial layout of development processes (Davezies, 2015; Jewtuchowicz, 2013; Markowski & Marszał, 2006).
- adverse demographic processes (Okólski & Fihel, 2012).
- the increase of social awareness and the need to impact development processes and current operations of territorial units, which forces more openness on the part of authorities and public administration to the influences of residents, and supports social consultations, or even the implementation of social participation in territorial management processes (e.g. The Act of 9 October 2015 on Revitalisation).

The abovementioned conditions change the understanding of what territory is. The attempt to describe the essence of the concept should take into consideration its dynamic and transformative character. Based on the open systems theory (von Bertalanffy, 1984), territory – as human habitat – was defined as a system of relationships encompassing the following, overlaying components (subsystems): spatial environment (living and inanimate matter), human capital (people), organisation – relationships between people and between people and spatial environment, as well as territorial system management, as a special component of the “organisation” subsystem (Noworól, 2007, pp. 18-26). Territory is therefore a phenomenon in which the aforementioned elements remain in a constantly changing correlation. Taking notice of material and immaterial aspects of territories is emphasised in a – popular nowadays – concept of the so-called territorial capital. It is defined as a set of localised (immobile) resources: natural, human, artificial (cultural), organisational, and cognitive, which constitute the competitive potential of the territory (Camagni, Caragliu, & Perucca, 2011, p. 61).

Noteworthy is the fact that the presented definitions of territories do not refer exclusively to the units of administrative division, but include the category of functional urban systems (Markowski, 2011, pp. 75-77), whose structure-building elements are links and flows: of people and goods, financial and accounting operations, and information (Domański, 2006, pp. 26-29).

Development and management of territorial development

Taking into account the dynamic understanding of the term “territory,” territorial development can be described as oriented changes that by stimulating driving forces, such as: entrepreneurship, balancing endo- and exogenous factors as well as competitiveness and cooperation, lead to processes consisting of creating new configurations of the system’s building elements, conditioning its more efficient (more effective and more economic) operation. These new configurations of elements include: increasing the complexity and flexibility of the subsystems, enhancing their self-regulating properties, increasing creativity and innovativeness of the subsystems, while being able to adapt the dynamics of changes and intensify contacts with the environment (Noworól, 2013, p. 21).

Using this conceptual pattern, the territorial management process must be regarded as an interdisciplinary problem, integrating numerous fields with diverse industry profiles and a high level of complexity. Development management, as a part of territorial unit management, is connected with the sphere of political life as well as urban development policy. Development management involves animating the development of territorial subsystems (spatial environment, human capital, public, social and economic organisations as well as existing territorial management systems), by the aforementioned changes (complexity, self-regulation, innovation, dynamics of changes, openness to the environment). The next step to the conceptualisation of development management are management attitudes toward civilisational challenges that stem from the evolution of the understanding of public management, as well as understanding the essence of development policy (e.g. territorial vs. sectoral approach, exogenous vs. endogenous, etc.). Development management cannot overlook the significance of industry subsystems, including political, social, economic, spatial, and technological issues concerning the functioning of territories. Finally – stimulating growth must include the stages of the territorial unit management process (more broadly in: Noworól, 2013, pp. 38-47).

We should emphasise that particularly in the socio-economic sphere, development has a quantitative dimension (growth of: capital, investment, production, employment, income, consumption), but it is also connected with qualitative changes: increasing the competitiveness of economy, technical progress, innovation,

connections of the economy, its size and ownership structure, and finally – increasing qualifications of the workforce. Unfortunately, usually – in the public discourse – the issues of development are reduced to the GDP growth, which does not enable explaining many contemporary social and territorial dilemmas, particularly those connected with the understanding of environmental issues, and the threat of climate change. As a result, we can observe a growing popularity of the so-called post-growth concept, drawing attention to the fact that liberalisation of economic policy and other policies promoting GDP growth cannot be a substitute for policies sensitive to environmental and social issues (Arrow et al., 1995).

Changing the institutional order vs. development management

The aforementioned civilisational processes influence the shift in the institutional order in which we live. As a result of the ICT development, and the subsequent multi-dimensional globalisation, for the last several dozen years, reforms have been introduced in the public sector. Due to them, managerial relationships between the public, social, and economic sectors are changing. Relations – often informal – between the entities of all three sectors are growing in importance, in the conditions of being rooted in diverse territorial scales: from the continental, to national, regional, and to the local dimension.

It is worthy of note that contemporary public management departed from traditional patterns and ideas, connected with the Weberian concept of administration and bureaucracy (Kulesza & Sześciło, 2013, pp. 49-51). Nowadays, the citizen “sees government as only one of the many institutions in a free-market society” (Stivers, 2009, p. 1095). Against the background of this new view of the role of public administration, the concept of governance was born. Ch. Pollitt and G. Bouchaert describe *governance* as a process that requires steering society through partnership networks between the public sector, enterprises, and civic society associations (Pollitt & Bouchaert, 2011, p. 21). Notions of “network” and “partnership” have fundamental meaning in this respect. In this context, R.A.W. Rhodes raises the issue of the significance of self-regulating inter-organisational networks, indicating their four distinctive features: (1) mutual interdependence of organisations, which means taking into account entities outside of the public sector, and breaking “boundaries” between the public, private, and social sphere; (2) continuous interactions between network members, caused by the need for a constant exchange of resources and negotiating objectives; (3) interactions with game-like features, based on trust and regulated by rules, negotiated and agreed on by members of the network, and as a result – (4) significant level of independence from the state, stemming from the fact that networks are

not accountable to the state; the state does not take a position of authority toward networks, but it can steer them indirectly (Rhodes, 1997, p. 53).

In the times of the growing popularity of social media sites, such as Facebook, 6 processes characteristic of information society described by J.S. Brown and P. Duguid have been growing in importance: despacialisation, demassification, decentralisation, denationalisation, disintermediation, and disaggregation (Brown & Duguid, 2000, p. 22). Especially disintermediation, which involves eliminating intermediaries and easier access to the information source, created new possibilities of creating relations between organisations from all sectors and between organisations and independent individuals who – in network systems – often become equal partners of organisations. It supports the creation of partner relationships and creates grounds for a characteristic alienation of public entities that manage development.

Driving action in a reality where numerous interactions occur between institutions/organisations from the public, economic, and social sectors takes the form of the so-called multi-level governance (Sroka, 2009). The multi-level aspect refers to empowerment of not only public authorities on multiple levels (multi-level), but also other entities connected within overlapping networks (multi-entity) in the management process. The foundation of the multi-level governance is the conviction that governance – despite being the domain of the state and local governments – should go beyond it, taking into account the private and the social sector. In this context, inter-organisational cooperation of multiple local actors gains key importance. As a result, a change occurs in the institutional and organisational order in which territorial communes operate. It also directly affects loosely associated residents, as members of the civic society, feeling responsible for local, national, and global issues. These are social movements usually organised around social media websites¹.

Endo- and exogenous models of territorial management

If we treat development as change, then – in the context of the described modifications of the institutional infrastructure of management – we can view changes in territories today from two perspectives. We shall describe them as an endogenous and exogenous perspective of development management. The core of the endogenous approach will be the influence of grassroots movements on shaping development processes. The term “exogenous perspective of development

¹ An example can be provided by Avaaz.org, a global community with over 44 million users, dedicated to making beliefs and views of people around the world which shape global decisions¹. Avaaz actions are joined by citizens of 194 countries. The Avaaz team operates in 18 countries on 6 continents, using 17 languages, including Polish (avaaz.org).

management” will be used in a situation where significant impact on the steering of territorial changes remains at the discretion of public administration, however, operating within conditions of multi-level governance.

Endogenous perspective – urban movements

Some of the actors of development policy who actively participate in development management processes are urban movements. In Poland this type of social activity appeared in the first decade of the 21st century, over 20 years after the phenomenon was described by M. Castells (1983), and it is consistent with two phenomena: increasing interest in “urban issues” in the broadest sense, and development of the sector of non-formalised social activity (community activism, fourth sector) operating side by side with, or in opposition to formalised NGOs undergoing professionalisation (Bogacz-Wojtanowska, 2015).

In the context of the premises presented above, it would be useful to outline the factors that impacted the development of urban movements, which in the Polish reality are a mixture of global and specifically Polish features of a post-socialist society. The first factor is accelerating processes of urbanisation, globalisation and metropolisation as well as the weakening position of the state. In the post-Fordian, knowledge-based economy, cities become the principal driving force of development, but they also play an increasingly important role in mobilising social resources and creating identity in a globalised world (Kubicki, 2016, p. 73). The heightened and lively discussion about the city in Poland can be interpreted as an expression of the accelerated modernisation after the accession to the EU, occurring within the Polish society which, previously deprived of socio-cultural foundations of urbanity, now acquires traits of urban society, redefining its identity (Kubicki, 2016; Pobłocki, Mergler, & Wudarski, 2013, p. 20). The expression of this process, which can be interpreted as accelerated social urbanisation (cf. Jakóbczyk-Gryszkiewicz, 2008, pp. 175-177), are also tensions between the expectation of infrastructural modernisation (including housing infrastructure), especially in dynamically developing metropolitan areas, and requirements of sustainable development and social and territorial cohesion.

The second, perhaps decisive factor of the emergence of urban movements is the growing – not only in Poland – criticism of the neoliberal urban development model, moving from the city focused on providing public services for its residents to the “entrepreneurial city” whose priority is the creation of investment climate that enable gaining the best position in global flow networks or driving consumption (Mayer, 2000; Pluciński, 2014a; Pobłocki et al., 2013). Globalisation is conducive to the adoption by local governments of strategies aiming at aggressive competition, taking into account mostly zero sum activities,

in which the success of one territory is achieved at the expense of another (Turok 2004, pp. 1074-1075), and the subordination of local development policy primarily to the strongest actors of the “game of cities” possessing the greatest political and lobbyist power. In Poland, it was accompanied by violent commercialisation of areas that determine the quality of life in the cities, such as housing, transport, or public space management (Jacobsson, 2015), as well as an inefficient spatial planning system and lack of institutional solutions that would force the management of functional zones development in the cities.

Yet another noteworthy aspect are deficits of traditional institutions of representative democracy that focuses on the act of voting, particularly at the national level (Pobłocki & Mergler, 2010). It is accompanied by the criticism of routinised, and often feigned or forced participation in making decisions relevant to residents (Olech & Sobiesiak-Penszko, 2012, p. 1).

The complexity of urban movements manifests in the great number of issues with which they occupy themselves (from housing, ecology, and transport to heritage preservation, and cultural or education policy), as well as forms and organisational structures (from informal neighbourhood initiatives to associations registered in the National Court Registry), or even in the territorial scale of their operations, as the concept of urban movements includes sub-local initiatives as well as regional or national cooperation agreements and networks (e.g. Polish Congress of Urban Movements). The diversity of undertaken activities is also significant. These include watchdog initiatives, lobbying and influencing local and central government authorities as well as supporting residents in the realisation of their vital needs, development of participation and direct democracy (Herbst, 2013). Ideological motivations of urban movements are equally varied – there are “middle-class” modernisation movements, protest movements (including NIMBY) and social movements (Pluciński, 2014b; Pobłocki et al., 2013). The matter of how political the movements are is ambiguous as well. Among their number, there are community activists who declare their apolitical status, urban think-tanks, and organisations that (often successfully) run in local elections, or even report the need to form an “urban political party” (Erbel, 2014; Kubicki, 2016; Pobłocki et al., 2013).

The analysis above indicates that the notion of urban movements and their role in development management are not easy to define. In sociological analyses, urban movements are framed as new social movements, defined in the opposition to social movements typical for the industrial society – mass movements associated with class struggle for economic interests. New social movements, characteristic of the post-industrial society focus on socio-cultural issues, interests or levels of conflict such as environmental issues, equal rights or human rights, and their electorate is not connected with any particular social class.

However, this division is not rigid, and what becomes evident nowadays, also in the case of urban movements, is mixing socio-cultural postulates with economic postulates, or even the increase of importance of the latter (Kurnicki, 2013; Roth, 2000). In contrast to old social movements striving to transform themselves into a hierarchical organisation based on formal membership, new movements are fluid, non-hierarchical and take the form of extended networks (Paleczny, 2010; Pluciński, 2014a).

As indicated above, an important role in the creation of the new type of social movements is played by the Internet and Information and Communications Technology, including the social media. It is noted by M. Castells who analysed great protest movements in the first decades of the 21st century. Networks-based social movements start to operate in the new hybrid public space, located between urban space and the new media space, providing autonomous communication. Its hybrid nature does not negate the territoriality of movements – it only extends their reach from the space of places to the space of flows (Castells, 2012, pp. 14, 24-28, 70).

M. Castells distinguishes three features of urban movements: self-definition through the reference to all matters concerning the city or community, local roots and territorial definition, and focus centred around three goals: improvement of collective consumption/public services quality (i.e. utility value of the city), cultural identity, and political involvement – understood as citizenship (Castells, 1983). One of the features of contemporary urban movements is a holistic approach to the city – manifested in the willingness to participate in all areas of urban policy, and treating the city as a cohesive entity, both in the process of urban processes analysis, and in public activities (Erbel, 2014). A distinctive feature of urban movements is also the ideological context in which they operate, based on the idea of “the right to the city” developed by H. Lefebvre (2012), and defined by D. Harvey as the power to shape urbanisation processes, a right to change and reinvent the city more after our hearts' desire (Harvey, 2012, pp. 22-23). A certain operationalisation of the right to the city takes the form of “9 Urban Theses” adopted by the Polish Congress of Urban Movements in 2011, and then expanded to 15 in 2015.²

The second idea that connects urban movements is urban democracy – the entirety of all forms of representative, direct and participatory democracy that function in the city (Mergler, 2011, pp. 163-164). Localness and locally developed solutions are supposed to be the answer to systemic ailments of democracy on the national or transnational scale (Pluciński, 2014b, p. 131). It is exemplified, among others, by the concept of site-specific narrative – as a tool for rebuilding,

² <https://kongresruhowmiejskich.pl/tezy-miejskie/>

on the local level, a democratic community consolidated around the idea of the common good and breaking ideological divisions, enabling joint action oriented on solving problems of residents, taken up by individuals and organisations emerging from various ideological sources (Pobłocki et al., 2013).

Following Sztompka, urban movements can be regarded as intermediaries in the chain of social processes – at the same time their product and vehicle, but also the creator and catalyst of changes (Sztompka, 2010, p. 258). The emergence of urban movements can be on the one hand treated as the effect of social transformation in Poland: urbanisation, development of information society, changes in civic attitudes, and adopting Western patterns of development. But they have also become a significant catalyst of the change in the approach to urban policy, and redefinition of the way of thinking about development – both on the local and state level.

Exogenous perspective – from the neo-Weberian model to hybrid partnerships

The exogenous perspective on development management assumes exerting deliberate and organised influence on development processes through the centres of authority and public administration, formally appointed to perform this role. Contemporary interpretation of such a perspective is provided by the so-called new regional policy. Due to spatial constraints of this publication, we have to limit ourselves to the presentation of the main indicators of such an understanding of this policy. They include:

- taking into account territorial consequences of such phenomena as: globalisation of economic, social, and cultural processes, climate change, unfavourable demographic processes, mounting energy costs;
- basing to a larger extent on the endogenous development potential of a territory, and to a smaller extent – on exogenous support mechanisms;
- territorialisation of intervention (*place-based policy*);
- introducing territorial distinctions in development policy, with the use of functional urban approach;
- strategic approach that consists of the focus on key priorities and efficient management;
- evaluation of the actual impact of intervention (*evidence-based policy*);
- taking into account the importance of the growth of actual and virtual social mobility;
- development of the formula of contracting development (territorial contracts);

- taking into account the role of various layers of governance and management, as well as various sectors within the multi-level management (Noworól, 2013, p. 124).

The evolution of social communication and contemporary ways of community organisation (e.g. via social networks), changes the understanding of public management, including development management. In relation to territorial issues, it is possible to indicate two main directions of the conceptualisation of such management. On the one hand, the so-called neo-Weberian concept is still functioning; it involves expanding the classic approach to public administration with elements of New Public Management and public governance (Kattel, 2015; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011). The model in this concept is the domination of impersonal, apolitical public administration, with a slight modification that lies in a superficial opening up to social and governance processes, connected to modern civilisational shifts. Some examples include: the popularity of participatory budgets, which usually concern the least significant part of cities' budgets, or administrative absorption of surrounding communes (or municipalities), or their parts by core cities, with social consultations, but also with the support of state authorities. It creates a safety buffer for public feeling, and feigning the inclination toward "social openness" of the management system in urban zones.

On the opposite pole of the quest for a territorial management model, numerous concept function parallelly, all built around such notions as governance, networks, partnership, transparency, and trust (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011, p. 11). Thus grows the significance of multi-level management, i.e. inter-organisational relationships in multi-level and multi-sector systems. Multi-level means the empowerment of entities other than administration entities in the process of management. The institutional infrastructure of territorial management includes both cooperating and competing institutions and organisations responsible for the functioning and development of these units, as well as a broad array of stakeholders³, situated in various sectors and at various levels of management. Multi-sectoral – hybrid – partnerships of public administration with entities from other sectors are increasingly growing in importance. Authorities and administration also open up to the participation of society through various forms of social consultations and – more broadly speaking – social participation.

In conclusion, it needs to be remarked that in contemporary territorial management, the key issue is to determine relationships – based on competition or cooperation – within a group of very diverse entities, legally and organisationally wise, operating in the public, social, and private (economic) sphere. Such an

³ An example can be provided by the relations of Integrated Territorial Investments and local action groups – new instruments of the European Union's cohesion policy.

organisational environment produces conditions for weakening the position of public administration.

The openness described here enables incorporating to the territorial management also social/urban movements, functioning as self-organising structures, here dubbed endogenous factors of change. Hybrid partnerships of authority and public administration with entities from the economic or social sector and urban movements create a dynamic institutional infrastructure that strengthens institutional change and forces political agents to listen to the voice of the society.

Summary

The management of territorial development entered the period of rapid civilisational changes, resulting from the growing importance of ICT in political, social, economic, and cultural life. Political and social consequences are difficult to determine, but an increasing influence of technology on every domain of life can be observed, including communication facilitations and the use of big data. In this situation, development management must approach dispersed sources of information on socio-economic processes, so – outside the sphere of authority and administration – take into account the increasingly diverse institutional infrastructure of steering territorial processes. Opening up management to entities from economic and social sectors is not sufficient. It becomes necessary to respect social movements – including urban movements – that bring into management systems not only new values, but also new mechanisms of dialogue and participation.

References

- Arrow, K., Bolin, B., Costanza, R., Dasgupta, P., Folke, C., Holling, C. S., Pimentel, D. (1995). Economic Growth, Carrying Capacity, and the Environment. *Science*, 286, 520-521.
- Bertalanffy von, L. (1984). *Ogólna teoria systemów. Podstawy, rozwój zastosowania*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Bogacz-Wojtanowska, E. (2015). *Inicjatywy społecznościowe – wyzwania dla zarządzania publicznego i polityk publicznych*. In: R. Krenz, S. Mock, & B. Skrzypczak (Eds.), *Efekt motyla. Scenariusze rozwoju sektora społecznościowego w Polsce*, Collegium Civitas i Centrum Wspierania Aktywności Lokalnej CAL, 197-210.
- Brown, J., & Duguid, P. (2000). *The Social Life of Information*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Camagni, R., Caragliu, A., & Perucca, G. (2011). *Territorial capital*. Milan: Politecnico di Milano.
- Castells, M. (1982). *Kwestia miejska*. Warszawa: PWN.

- Castells, M. (1983). *The City and the Grassroots*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Castells, M. (2012). *Sieci oburzenia i nadziei. Ruchy społeczne w erze internetu*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Davezies, L. (2015). Le Grand Paris, le joker de l'économie française. *Revue de l'OFCE*, 143(7), 75.
- Dawson, R. (2008). *The Flow Economy – Opportunities and Risks in the New Convergence*. In: R. Dawson (Ed.). *Living Networks. Leading Your Company, Customers, and Partners*. Lulu Press Inc, 124-147.
- Domański, R. (2006). *Gospodarka przestrzenna. Podstawy teoretyczne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Erbel, J. (2014). Ruchy miejskie jako nowa forma zaangażowania społecznego. *Władza Sądzenia*, 4, 37-47.
- Harvey, D. (2012). *Bunt Miast. Prawo do miasta i Miejska Rewolucja*. Warszawa: Fundacja Bęc Zmiana.
- Herbst, K. (2013). *Ruchy nieformalne a kierunki rozwoju ekonomii społecznej. Rekomendacje dla polityk publicznych*. Warszawa: Centrum Rozwoju Zasobów Ludzkich.
- Jacobsson, K. (2015). *Introduction: The development of Urban Movements in Central and Eastern Europe*. In: K. Jacobsson (Ed.). *Urban Grassroots Movements in Central and Eastern Europe*, Abington: Routledge, 1-33.
- Jakóbczyk-Gryszkiewicz, J. (2008). *Procesy urbanizacji*. In: S. Liszewski (Ed.), *Geografia urbanistyczna*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 155-186.
- Jewtuchowicz, A. (2013). *Kreatywna gospodarka, kreatywne miasto – nowy model rozwoju ?* In: F. Kuźnik (Ed.), *Badania miejskie i regionalne. Doświadczenia i perspektywy*. Warszawa: Studia KPZK PAN, CLIII/2013, 43-56
- Kattel, R. (2015). What would Max Weber Say about Public Sector Innovation? *The NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, VIII(1), 9-19.
- Kubicki, P. (2016). Polskie ruchy miejskie: polityczne czy kulturowe? *Przegląd Socjologiczny*, 1, 65-79.
- Kulesza, M., & Sześciło, D. (2013). *Polityka administracyjna i zarządzanie publiczne*. Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer.
- Kurnicki, K. (2013). (Nowe) ruchy miejskie - w stronę socjologicznego opisu. *Trzeci Sektor*, 31.
- Lefebvre, H. (2012). Prawo do miasta. *Praktyka Teoretyczna*, 5, 183-197.
- Markowski, T. (2011). Dylematy terytorialnego wymiaru w krajowych i regionalnych dokumentach strategicznych. *Studia KPZK PAN*, CXXXVII.
- Markowski, T., & Marszał, T. (2006). *Metropolie. Obszary metropolitalne. Metropolizacja. Problemy i pojęcia podstawowe*. Warszawa: KPZK PAN.
- Mayer, M. (2000). *Urban social movements in an era of globalisation*. In: P. Hamel, H. Lustiger-Thaler, & M. Mayer (Eds.), *Urban Movements in a Globalising World*. London: Routledge, 141-156.
- Mergler, L. (2011). *Konflikty o przestrzeń a stan demokracji miejskiej na wybranych przykładach w Poznaniu*. In: P. Pluciński & M. Nowak (Eds.), *O miejskiej sferze publicznej. Obywatelskość i konflikty o przestrzeń*. Kraków: Ha!Art, 163-182.

- Noworól, A. (2007). *Planowanie rozwoju terytorialnego w skali regionalnej i lokalnej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Noworól, A. (2013). *Ku nowemu paradygmatowi planowania terytorialnego*. Warszawa: CeDeWu.
- Okólski, M., & Fihel, A. (2012). *Demografia : współczesne zjawiska i teorie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR Sp. z o.o.
- Olech, A., & Sobiesiak-Penszko, P. (2012). Partycypacja publiczna w Polsce. Diagnoza i rekomendacje. *Analizy i Opinie*, 3, 1-24.
- Paleczny, T. (2010). *Nowe ruchy społeczne*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Pluciński, P. (2014a). „Miasto to nie firma!” Dylematy i tożsamość polityczna miejskich ruchów społecznych we współczesnej Polsce. *Przegląd Socjologiczny*, 63 (LXIII)(1), 137-170.
- Pluciński, P. (2014b). *Demokracja miejska, czyli lokalizm, miejskie ruchy społeczne i walki o miasto*. In: M. Baranowski (Ed.), *Demokracja i rola obywatela. o napięciu pomiędzy państwem, społeczeństwem i procesami globalizacyjnymi*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Wydziału Nauk Społecznych UAM, 127-148.
- Pluciński, P. (2014c). O roszczeniach pozaparlamentarnej (post?) polityki. Przypadek miejskich ruchów społecznych w Polsce. *Władza Sądzenia*, 3, 67-76.
- Pobłocki, K., & Mergler, L. (2010). Nic o nas bez nas: polityka skali a demokracja miejska. *Res Publica Nowa*, 201-202, 7-14.
- Pobłocki, K., Mergler, L., & Wudarski, M. (2013). *Anty-bezradnik przestrzenny: prawo do miasta w działaniu*. Warszawa: Fundacja Res Publica.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouchaert, G. (2011). *Public Management Reform* (third edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rhodes, R. (1997). *Understanding Governance: Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity and Accountability*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Rifkin, J. (2016). *Społeczeństwo zerowych kosztów krańcowych. Internet przedmiotów. Ekonomia współdzielenia. Zmierzch kapitalizmu*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Studio.
- Roth, R. (2000). *New social movements, poor people's movements and the struggle for social citizenship*. In P. Hamel, H. Lustiger-Thaler, & M. Mayer (Eds.), *Urban Movements in a Globalising World*. London: Routledge, 25-44.
- Sroka, J. (2009). *Deliberacja i rządzenie wielopasmowe. Teoria i praktyka*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Stivers, C. (2009). The Ontology of Public Space: Grounding Governance in Social Reality. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 52/7, 1095-1108.
- Sztompka, P. (2010). *Socjologia zmian społecznych*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.
- Ustawa z 9 października 2015 r. o rewitalizacji (2015).